THE

TRUE ALARM;

CONSISTING OF

I. A Deſcant on the Preſent National Propenſity.

II. A Sketch of a Refutation of Mr. Locke, being the Seventh Letter of the Candid Suggeſtions.

III. An Appendix, containing a Friendly Challenge, and Thoughts on the Ruinous Conſequences of an Equal Repreſentation.

Party's dark clouds alike to riſe above,
And reach the firmament of public love!

Hayley's Eſſay on Epic Poetry, Ep. 5, V. 411.

By B. N. TURNER, M. A.
Author of the Candid Suggeſtions.

PRINTED BY W. HARROD,
FOR ~~T. LOWNDES, FLEET STREET,~~
M DCC LXXXIII.

[Price ONE SHILLING.]

BRITISH MUSEUM

A

DESCANT

ON THE

PRESENT NATIONAL PROPENSITY.

HAVING been adviſed to detach the Diſquiſition on Government and Civil Liberty, contained in the ſeventh Letter of the CANDID SUGGESTIONS † from the heterogeneous matter with which it is there ſurrounded, I have accordingly ventured to reprint it, with large additions of a ſimilar nature, and yet at ſo reduced a price as to juſtify the hope, that it may be now as commonly known as the voice of friendſhip has aſſured me it deſerves to be.

Though I have taken the liberty to diſſent in ſome meaſure from Mr. Locke, (for reaſons which I hope I may now look upon as unanſwerable) yet I beg to

† I have preſumed to call my ſeventh Letter a *Diſquiſition*, becauſe I have endeavored to render this, as well as all the reſt, diſtinct eſſays on their reſpective ſubjects, without any neceſſary reference to the ingenious work to which they appeared as an Anſwer.

have it obſerved that his cauſe and mine are, properly ſpeaking, one and the ſame thing. Thoſe very revolution principles which he defended, and which have been for a long time the baſis of the Engliſh government, are what I have been anxious to preſerve, from a danger of which Mr. Locke was probably not aware, I mean the danger ariſing from *their own exceſs*. This ſubject then, however unpopular at preſent, I ſhall endeavour to proſecute with the ſame free ſpirit, with which, I muſt think, Mr. Locke himſelf would have treated it had he been now alive. I wiſh not to aggravate the preſent dangers, but we cannot ſpeak too plainly or too forcibly of ſuch as ſeem to aim at acquiring even the *capacity* of enſlaving their country.

The haſty ſtrides which have been ſo lately taken towards anarchy or miſrule, are in themſelves ſufficiently alarming, but are rendered much more ſo by by the apprehenſion of their being countenanced even by *Miniſtry* itſelf. Now if our political ſafety depends, as it evidently does, on the juſt balance of power in the common-wealth, we have good reaſon to be jealous of any miniſters who ſhall not appear to be truly attached to that prerogative of which they are conſtitutionally the guardians. — God forbid that I ſhould be underſtood to mean that they may therefore entrench on the liberties of the people; --- ſhould they make ſo nefarious an attempt, we ſhould eaſily, I truſt, know how to deal with them. I mean only that they are more peculiarly obliged to protect

thoſe much-neglected *rights of the crown*,* without which I do affirm that the rights of the people cannot long ſubſiſt.

Under ſuch circumſtances it muſt ſurely be afflictive to every lover of his country to obſerve that, comparatively ſpeaking, every tongue,‡ every pen, is ſtill employed to trumpet forth liberty --- liberty, nothing but liberty ---

> While liberty the woods,
> And liberty the floods,
> And liberty the rocks and hollow mountains ring.

It is true indeed that the *ſmall ſtill voice* of reaſon may ſometimes be diſtinguiſhed, but this will be

* Major Cartwright (as might well be expected) has not forgot the hackney'd ſarcaſm about there being "ſomething behind the throne which is greater than Majeſty itſelf" (Give us our Rights, p. 5.)— The truth is, that we ought to ſuffer nothing greater than Majeſty, or that is capable of over-awing the executive power, to be behind, before, or near the throne. The firſt ſpring of general liberty is the liberty of the chief Magiſtrate, or his having the full and uncontrouled exertion of thoſe rights with which he is inveſted by the laws; and it would be folly to expect that he who holds the ſcales of juſtice, can be able to hold them evenly, if he is not permitted to hold them freely. — An Eſquimeaux (or Innuet) chief, being introduced to George II. was aſked by him "whether his were a *free people?*" which being properly explained, the warrior anſwered "Yes, that they are, *for I am free myſelf.*"

‡ In one reſpect we have for ſome years exhibited to the world a moſt extraordinary and ridiculous phenomenon --- A proud nation determined to find fault with every thing that could be done either by or in favor of itſelf --- enraged at the ſmalleſt reflection that could be caſt on any of it's enemies--and ſneering at the very idea of there being any poſſible excuſe to be made for any who had been it's friends; and thus it has happened (credite poſteri!)

but little attended to ſo long as there is alſo a ſtrong wind, an earthquake, and a fire, however certain it may be that the *Lord is in none of theſe.*

I am ſo far from intending to ſupport a party, that I am only afraid there is ſcarce any party left for me to ſupport. If this then be the caſe --- if there be reaſon to fear that, either diſguſted by the ingratitude of their country, or intimidated by it's violence, it's true friends have deſerted it's cauſe, alas! what have we not to apprehend? — This is ſurely matter of TRUE ALARM --- No axiom can be clearer than that the extreme of liberty † is equally dangerous with that of ſlavery, or rather that theſe extremes meet in one point, and are ſcarcely diſtinguiſhable from each other. Whenever anarchy takes place we may ſay in a moral ſenſe "Chaos is come again." A dance of atoms, or of ſomething much worſe, ſucceeds to the order and harmony of that moſt beautiful of all *human creations*, if I may be allowed the expreſſion, --- a legal government.

that through the whole of a war, more truly glorious than any thing Lewis XIV. could boaſt of, we have been ſtudiouſly deviſing how to caſt the greateſt odium or diſgrace on every thing that was or could be done, *for fear we ſhould ſpeak in favour of the late miniſtry.* — It may be aſked whether Mr. Pitt could have conquered under ſuch circumſtances?

† Though it is to the outcry about liberty, that our preſent misfortunes, as well as future apprehenſions owe their origin, yet, we cannot bring ourſelves to diſtinguiſh between the thing itſelf and the abuſe of it. By a fineſſe of party the *name* (which includes both) has been dexterouſly repreſented as ſo ſacred, that to ſpeak *freely*, even of *liberty* itſelf, would be no leſs a crime than what Dr. Kennicot ſays was objected to him, namely, "that he ſpent his time in writing *againſt* the word of God."

That affairs at preſent have a ſtrong *tendency* at leaſt, to the diſſolution of all order in the commonwealth, is but too apparent. From whence then ſhall we look for a remedy or prevention of this calamity? Suppoſing the weakneſs of the crown to be the very malady itſelf, we can expect no aſſiſtance from that quarter. The peers, I apprehend, were conſtituted one of the eſtates of this realm, principally for the purpoſe of forming a barrier between the other two. They are an intermediate power to ward off all encroachments whether of the crown or the people. † Should they however prove unable, or unwilling to preſerve the political balance, the laſt appeal is to be made to the people themſelves; and if a free people will not ſave themſelves, there is no power on earth able to do it for them. Let thoſe who imagine that an opinion once taken up ought to be defended, be told that it is even proverbially true, that "wiſe men will change their minds, but fools never will." Let the gallant ſpirits be reminded that it is a ſpecies of cowardice to oppoſe ſuch a government as has for years laboured under

† The great miſchief is, that *the people* can never be brought to believe that any encroachments can come from themſelves: the pride of human nature leads them to conclude that it is impoſſible that they themſelves can ever have too much power; why then ſhould they blame the greateſt tyrant that ever lived for thinking the ſame thing? But will they be always like the one-ey'd ſtag? Surely nothing can be more impolitic than to be apprehenſive of no danger except from one particular quarter.

inſults, which it has not dared to take notice of. Let it be hinted to the inteillgent part of the community, that the trueſt friend to liberty, in the preſent times, is undoubtedly *the crown.* The higher orders of the ſtate ſhould be moved by a ſenſe of hereditary honor, and the lower by a diſplay of that peace and happineſs they now enjoy, inſtead of being made (as is certainly intended) the butchers and executioners of each other; and I will be anſwerable that their real grievances would be eaſily redreſſed, if we could but once get rid of thoſe fictitious ones which have been ſo artfully contrived. Every method in ſhort ſhould be taken to diſabuſe thoſe who have been miſled by the outcries of intereſted partizans. The fervour which has been raiſed for evil purpoſes ſhould be diverted to good ones. The people ſhould be made deeply ſenſible of their real danger,* and that it was not for the King's ſake but for *theirs* that

* Nations, as well as individuals, if they are once perſuaded they have a ſtrong conſtitution, are generally too apt to make free with it, and thus perhaps tempt their own diſſolution, ſooner than ſuch as are naturally more infirm. When the nation was ſiezed with a fit of hypochondriacs, it hugg'd it's political doctor (Mr. Pitt) careſſed, implored, beſought, him to ſave it's life; the patient was all obedience and generoſity, the Dr. preſcribed ably, and the cure was perfected. Soon after however, in the wantonneſs of high health and preſumption, it deſpiſed the ſymptoms pointed out by it's new Dr. (Lord North) and proved refractory to every thing he could adviſe. He tried indeed to cure the patient againſt it's will, but through it's unaccountable obſtinacy, it's conſtitution received a ſhock which it will never perhaps be able to recover.

the conſtitution was eſtabliſhed; that it is not for the King's ſake but for *theirs* that it ought to be ſupported.*

One great ſource of our misfortunes has been that popular miſtake (whether founded on artifice or inattention) by which we have all along confounded the oppoſers of government in former times, with thoſe of the preſent day: yet ſurely this deluſion might eaſily be removed. Thoſe great characters to whom poſterity has done ample juſtice, diſdained to encourage, or even to give way to the popular prejudices of their times, but firmly reſiſted that party whoſe increaſing influence was inconſiſtent with true liberty. This was their praiſe, and this is the true point of patriotiſm; for what merit is there in ſwimming

* If ever aſſociations can be proper or defenſible, it muſt be in ſuch caſes as the preſent. For want of proper exertions the body politic appears as if it had loſt the uſe of one ſide by a kind of ſtate apoplexy. The country gentlemen are the ſheet anchor of liberty, and on all emergencies ſhould ſtand forth in it's defence. Sure I am that the true ſpirit of Engliſhmen is by no means extinct among this moſt reſpectable body of men. I recollect to have ſeen amongſt others, in the public prints, the ſpeeches of Sir Thomas Broughton in Cheſhire, and Henry Shiffner, Eſq; in Herefordſhire, which did them the higheſt honor. This is the ſort of men which ſhould be returned by the counties to parliament; I do not mean that the parliament ſhould be filled with country gentlemen only — no — they, I think, ſhould have the poſt of honor, but it is equally neceſſary that there ſhould be ſuch as have applied more cloſely to ſtate affairs, and profeſſional men of various kinds, and, — N. B. — for the admiſſion of theſe, the ſmall boroughs, by a kind of *providential inequality*, are admirably adapted.

with

with the ſtream? They oppoſed the kingly power, not becauſe it was kingly, but becauſe it was unduly and intolerably predominant: But now, through the natural mutability of human affairs, oppoſition is become government, and government oppoſition. The revolution principles are defended by miniſtry, (at leaſt by the late miniſtry, Lord North's) while their oppoſers are endeavouring to eſtabliſh a tyranny, of a different nature indeed but ſurely as formidable as that of James II. Will any one then perſuade me that a Hampden, a Ruſſel, a Somers, a Locke, or even a Sidney, (as great a republican as he is ſuppoſed to be) would, if now alive, oppoſe ſuch a government as this? Would they endeavour to increaſe the popular torrent which now bears down all before it? § Surely not: The ſame ſenſe of honor

§ A ſtate criminal is now ſo far from having occaſion to fear a court of juſtice, that he may bully and inſult it with the utmoſt freedom and emolument. (Compare the trials of Mr. Horne in the reign of George III, and that of Mr. Baxter in the reign of James II.) and an ex-officio information againſt him can ſeldom fail of making his fortune. In the *golden* days of Elizabeth, a man who had been condemned to have his right hand cut off, for having ſaid ſomething in a pamphlet about the queen's marrying, as ſoon as ſentence was executed, ſnatched his hat off with the left, and cried "God ſave the Queen." And even in the beginning of the preſent *iron* reign if a man could contrive to affront the ſovereign, he was in danger of being ſent to the king's bench priſon, and there perſecuted with turkeys, minc'd-pies, &c. but now his utmoſt puniſhment or diſgrace would probably be, a ſilver cup, or the freedom of the city or the draper's company in a gold box, or perhaps a monumental ſtatue in white marble, &c. &c.

and

and love of their country, could not fail of exciting them to the defence of that government, by which the bleſſings of liberty, which they aimed at introducing are now eſtabliſhed and ſecured; ſo that they alone who have courage enough to act thus in the preſent times, are the true and genuine ſucceſſors of theſe ancient worthies.

Far be it from me to inſinuate that there are no honeſt and upright men in the preſent oppoſition; I am well convinced there are many ſuch, who, for want of narrowly conſidering the above diſtinction, or from various circumſtances of connection, or perhaps inſenſibly led on by the faſcination of public compliments and careſſes, huzzas, health-drinkings, &c. &c. have unawares ſupported a party which, as it is gaining an undue aſcendency, they ought rather to have been jealous of. To ſolve this difficulty we may call to mind that many perſons ſupported James II. who had given the moſt unequivocal proofs of their integrity, as, for inſtance, Sancroft and the deprived biſhops; with theſe therefore all who at preſent, through a decided opinion, have abetted the popular exaltation, need not bluſh to be compared.* --- But

* The miſtake is the ſame in both caſes. Many good men formerly believed in a natural, divine, unalienable, irreſiſtible power in kings, and many equally good men at preſent have been led to attribute the ſame enormous priviledges to the people. This is the doctrine of Mr. Locke, but — Bernardus non videt omnia — we ſhould remember that Mr. Locke is not infallible. This great philoſopher plainly ſaw that there was no ſuch right divine in kings, but unfortunately he did not ſuſpect the

as to thoſe worſt of citizens, who have long laboured to throw every thing into confuſion --- ſumma imis miſcere --- thoſe firebrands of the ſtate, who would light up their beacons, not in Smithfield only but every where elſe; and who wiſh not to quench the aſhes of their burning country, but with the blood of it's inhabitants --- ſuch men as theſe may think themſelves well off to be no worſe matched than with a Jeffries, or a Father Petre.

I ſincerely wiſh I was able to give an adequate repreſentation of the new tyranny and uſurpation by which we are threatened, but this I fear is out of my power, on account of the very great diſadvantages of ſituation, and my total want of communication with every party whatſoever. I will endeavour however, to give a ſketch of the nature of this upſtart autocratic power by which, I doubt, it will too plainly appear to have all the principal traits of the moſt abſolute and deſpotic government. This new fangled potentate has aſſumed the very title of ſovereignty, *the Majeſty of*

truth, namely, that ſuch monſtrous rights could in fact be no where at all. To found the rights of one party on thoſe of another would be only putting the tortoiſe under the elephant; and to make them *unalienable* on either ſide muſt deſtroy thoſe of the other. All ſciences are tending towards perfection, and it may be hoped and expected that ſome genius will ariſe who ſhall be able to remove the dangerous principles of deſpotiſm, as claimed by the people, in the ſame manner as Mr. Locke has done with regard to kings, and thereby *clear the ground* for the erection of a juſt and equal ſyſtem of government, in which the rights of both parties ſhall be reciprocally eſtabliſhed and aſcertained.

the People! § To this great and glorious Majeſty it is that we muſt all of us bow the neck; it's authority is not to be queſtioned; it's decrees are not to be reſiſted; and in the exaltation of this pſeudo-tyrant, if I may be allowed the expreſſion, we may be ſaid to be threatened, in a political ſenſe, with the *reign of the beaſt*. --- Well then --- this many-headed Majeſty has now ſet up it's claims, which, in fact, are but a revival of the old ones; it arrogates to itſelf an excluſive right to govern, jure divino, — a natural, hereditary, unalienable, indefeaſible title to ſupreme authority, ‖ (ſo that here we have the very eſſence of tyranny) --- It has it's party-writers of every degree from the higheſt tot he loweſt, † it's penſioners, ‡ it's paraſites,

§ The *Majeſty of the People* is a contradiction in terms. *Majeſty* means abſtractedly the collective honor of a great empire as concentered in it's chief magiſtrate.

‖ Mr. Locke and his followers paſſim.

† Some years ago one of the people's people, who uſed to be called "Humphrey Coats that cares for no man" was familiarly ſaluted in the park by a very ſmart ragged fellow with half a cock'd hat, &c. A perſon who was walking with him wiſhed to know who that ſhabby companion was, whom he choſe to be ſo civil to, — Oh, that's a writer in oppoſition, and we *muſt* take notice of thoſe people. — A writer! why ſurely it is a reflection then upon your party to let him go ſo ragged — Why to be ſure, ſays Coats, he is in no very high ſtile, he is only the man that chalks No. 45 upon the ſhop-windows.

‡ In fact the king-people generally bribes with a more than princely munificence, even before it is able to ſieze the reigns of government (but it is in order to do ſo) as witneſs the endleſs gratuities, ſubſcriptions, donations, treats, remittances of tobacco, preſents, legacies, lucrative offices, annuities, thanks, puffs, qualifications, ſupport at elections, &c. See Mr. Horne's

it's abject and ſervile flatterers, * --- It has it's well-meaning conſcientious adherents, as alſo it's friendly councellors, who, with honeſt bluntneſs dare to ſpeak the truth, though ſure of incurring it's indignation by ſo doing. --- It catches eagerly at every doctrine that favors it's own ambition, † and places all ſecurity § in the eſtabliſhment of it's own ſupremacy, nor ever dreams of giving up, for the public good, any priviledge with which it has been once inveſted. ‡ --- It has it's miniſtry, it's interior junto, and even it's officers of ſtate are likely to be ſoon appointed, as we have

letters, late Iriſh votes, &c. and in ſhort almoſt every news-paper and magazine for theſe laſt twenty years.

* It is remarkable that the *very terms* of the groſſeſt flattery of former times has been revived in obſequiouſneſs to this new deſpot. We read of a certain king "who on a ſet day, arrayed in royal apparel, ſat on his throne and made an oration unto the people, and the people gave a ſhout ſaying, *it is the voice of a God and not of a man.*" (Acts xii, 21.) and this is exactly the ſtile in the preſent caſe, "*vox populi, vox Dei.*"!

† "In thoſe numerous meetings in town and country which lately petitioned parliament, *the people*, in every inſtance, eagerly embraced as much of that doctrine [their own ſupremacy] as was laid before them." (Mr. Cartwright, p. 4.) This indeed is natural, and here permit me to obſerve that the luſt of power increaſes with the poſſeſſion; ſo that, as in abſolute monarchies, ambition ſeems merely confined to the government, ſo in free ſtates it is much ſtronger in the people than in their rulers.

§ It was a favorite boaſt among the Jacobites in K. William's time that "there could not poſſibly be any national *ſecurity* till the king had his rights reſtored." Thus Mr. Cartwright (preface) "Give us our rights and then all will be *ſafe!*"

‡ As for inſtance, the late fatal preventing of levies by the city of London: how unlike it's conduct in 1690, and on ſome

lately

lately heard a certain gentleman called *the ſecretary of the people.* With this mock-monarch *favouritiſm* is the only merit, and though it cannot decently withhold it's ſeeming countenance from ſome brilliant exploits, yet it never really likes any that will not go all lengths for it's aggrandizement, nor will it ever forgive thoſe who refuſe to do ſo. It's favourites are ſure to be ſkreened and protected in all poſſible emergencies; nay perhaps they *may even have a chance* of being advanced to the higheſt honors and preferments, while, as to thoſe who are it's true friends, ſome weak part or other, ſome miſtaken or unguarded action may always be found out by which their ruin may be effected. Though it cannot abſolutely ſhut up the preſs, nor aſſume an open authority to licenſe, yet the exceſſive influence it has acquired over the generality of publications, as well as over the minds of the people, amounts (experto crede) to much the ſame thing. If you write with freedom and public ſpirit you may indeed purchaſe the dead letter of an advertiſement, and there it ends, (unleſs in caſe of a great name, and then you are noticed only to be abuſed); but ſhould any thing inflammatory or diſaffected come out, what quoting! what praiſing! what trumpeting! in news-papers, maga-

later occaſions! Strange! that the king ſhould be for ever diſplaying patriotic virtues, and his ſubjects act as if they had no intereſt in the common welfare. Can nothing but fear make us wiſe and loyal? Let us then fear — only let our fears be directed the right way.

zines,

zines, reviews, in ſhort in every public print which does not wiſh to be ſneered at as *miniſterial*, or, what is ſtill worſe, --- lie unfold on the printer's hands. ‡ This new tyrant has revived the moſt dangerous practice of over-ruling the freedom of parliament by it's interference, which it grounds on a falſe deduction from the people's right of chuſing. To compleat this ſubjection of the commons, they are to be diſſolved every year, (but why not every month, for ſurely ſuch politics have more to do with the moon than the ſun?) ſo that they may come cap in hand * to plead their reſpective merits in pulling down the regal power, that great rival and enemy † of the

‡ As we are now become a nation of political calculators, it might be no incurious inveſtigation to find out whether there has been more money gained for ſome years paſt by publiſhing lies, or loſt by publiſhing the truth.

* Let the people beware of thoſe who come *cap in hand*, this is not the action of a friend. They who fawn, and cant, and cringe, and make them believe they are able to be great ſtateſmen themſelves, are pretty ſure to betray them and laugh at them into the bargain; and he who is guilty of the moſt fulſome flattery when ſoliciting their votes will probably divert himſelf as they come up to poll by obſerving "no --- I think that can't be a friend of mine, he has got too good a coat upon his back."

† Mr. Cartwright and others have repreſented the houſe of commons as choſen only to *reſiſt* government, which they term it's *adverſary*, &c. What? --- ſhall a wiſe and gallant nation eſtabliſh, at the expence of it's blood, the beſt ordered government upon earth only to be at enmity with it ever after? That a friendly ſtruggle for ſuperiority between the *genuine* parties of Whig and Tory has often a good effect, I believe, is true; but if once we can be made to believe that that power was appointed for our hurt, which the Almighty tells us was appointed for our

majeſty

majeſty of the people. It can ſtrike at charters ‖ at once, without the formality of a quo warranto; and the two univerſities ought particularly to look about them, as it has been declared by one, who I believe is in the ſecret, that the intention is to ſerve them in

good, we ought doubtleſs not only to *reſiſt*, but to get rid of it as ſoon as we can. The truth is, --- the houſe of commons is the *elective* as that of the lords is the *hereditary* great council of the nation. Now the very word *council* implies that they are appointed not to oppoſe, thwart and baffle the chief magiſtrate, but to aſſiſt, adviſe, and cooperate with him in all matters for the public ſervice. It is true indeed they ought to guard againſt his encroachments, but then ſurely the ſalus populi equally requires that he ſhould guard againſt theirs.

‖ There may be caſes in which charters ought to be altered; for inſtance, the charter of Maſſachuſet's bay was by ſome overſight at firſt ſo unhappily formed that it's government could not poſſibly be carried on under it. What then was the legiſlature to do? It iſſued a new one; I believe there was no alternative; and yet what a *diſmal* outcry was raiſed by a certain party againſt this tyrannical violation of the *ſacred right* of charters! But now, for a purpoſe the moſt ruinous that can be imagined, we are to be taught a very different leſſon --- the ſacred rights of charters are to be held in the utmoſt contempt, ſo fooliſh is it to think at preſent in the ſame manner that a little while ago was the greateſt wiſdom. In the account of the York meeting a gentleman was introduced, as a foil to the reſt, who had not yet got the better of the abſurd prejudices in favor of chartered liberties, and was made to be ſo *very ridiculous* as to ſay "what! diſfranchiſe Beverley! diſfranchiſe Beverley!" Thus then this *chartered libertine* the people, or rather, I ſhould ſay, this chartered dupe is made to ſhift ſides perpetually at the command of it's maſters, and that too, ſometimes, with an agility of motion that is perperfectly aſtoniſhing; (there is an inſtance, I think in Junius on the Daniſh rupture),

the

the ſame manner as the monaſteries were ſerved. If the former tyranny had it's foreign ſeminary for education, ſo has the latter, and what Rome was to the one, Geneva is to the other, (the ſoil in or near Italy may well be ſaid to be underlaid with combuſtibles) though indeed we have reaſon to think that in ſome of our own public ſchools, the faſhionable doctrine of *active diſobedience* has of late, in ſpite of the maſters, been very ſucceſsfully imbibed. Sermons on political ſubjects are, as heretofore, not to be tolerated, unleſs they be in favor of the party which has the aſcendency, and hiſtory† we know, has long ſince been made ſubſervient to the ſame purpoſes. But above all, this newfangled power ſeems to be prepoſterouſly and unnatu-

† Are we not authorized to ſuſpect at leaſt that ſome degree of the ſame ſpirit which we condemn in the perſecutors of Sidney, has appeared in the treatment which Sir John Dalrymple has received on his account? The papers which this gentleman found in the archives of France were of ſome conſequence to the truth of hiſtory, and therefore it was his duty, as an honeſt man and a faithful hiſtorian, to lay them before the public that their authenticity might be fairly canvaſſed; and yet, for ſo doing, he has been ever ſince purſued with unceaſing bitterneſs, becauſe the papers, if true, reflected on the character of a favorite republican. There ſeems ſomething very ſtrange and unlike the conduct of proteſtants in this affair. I confeſs I ſee nothing ſo very *immaculate* in the character of a republican, though indeed it is but juſtice to ſuppoſe that Algernon Sidney would not have been ſuch had he lived at the preſent day: for I cannot agree with judge Jefferies in pronouncing that he was *born a traitor*. (See Trial of A. S.)

rally

rally providing itſelf with a military force,‡ (for why ſhould the *many* have an army to protect them againſt the *few?*) and that too *new-modelled* with a vengeance, tho' for what purpoſe, unleſs to overturn legal government, it may be difficult to determine.* Such are ſome of thoſe alarming "ſigns of the times," which, together with the exceſſive profligacy of manners, ſeem to indicate the approach at leaſt (if it be not already arrived) of that worſt of all tyrannies, the domination of the people.†

On the other hand it is obvious, that the regal authority (our principal ſafeguard) muſt be neceſſarily declining, in proportion as the other gains ground. The negative on bills, which conſtitutes the ſovereign one of the eſtates of this realm, is nearly, if not

‡ This is the caſe at leaſt in Ireland, and I have ſeen attempts to recommend it here; and particularly, I remember, in an inflammatory eſſay ſigned *Alfred*, where were other nefarious inſinuations. And here let me note, that I have obſerved in ſome of the papers that whenever there is a letter more miſchievous than ordinary, the printer in his poſtſcript makes a reference "For ſuch a letter ſee ſuch a page."

* Something like this (if I miſtake not) is openly recommended in Junius's letters, where he ſpeaks with approbation of the diſtant legions of Rome, for marching up to the capital and dethroning their emperor whenever they thought proper.

† How dreadful the domination of the people is to the people themſelves, may be ſeen by the exceſſive and rapturous joy they have always expreſſed when they have been able to emerge from this calamitous ſituation. This is well deſcribed in a paſtoral poem, by far the moſt beautiful the world ever ſaw; I ſcarcely need add that I mean the Gentle Shepherd of Allan Ramſay.

entirely taken from him, and he is in imminent danger of being reduced to a mere ſigning clerk.* The intimimidating outcries againſt ex officio informations tend to leave him in a ſtate ſcarcely diſcernible from that of an out-law. The reduction of places and penſions, however convenient it may appear, † is certainly a

* To be robbed of this power is what our great deliverer K. William would not ſubmit to. It ought, no doubt, to be uſed very ſparingly, and with great caution; but entirely to ſet it aſide, by impeaching the miniſter if ever it be exerted, ſeems not only unreaſonable, but may ſometimes be attended with dangerous conſequences. Faction may run ſo high at a particular time, that in the paroxyſm of national madneſs, a majority may be gained in both houſes to the moſt ruinous act: the conſtitutional reſource in this caſe is the king and privy council, and if by advice of this he gives a negative, this is, and ſurely ought to be, full as regular and effectual as a vote of either houſe of parliament. Whereas in the preſent ſtate of things a caſe may ariſe, (nay, and is likely to ariſe) in which the king may be *forced* to ſign an act, though he may be *morally certain* that he is ſigning away his own crown, and the happineſs, welfare, or perhaps the very exiſtence of the ſtate by ſo doing; nor can he be blamed, for how can he be able to protect us, when he is unable to protect himſelf? Amongſt all the admirers of our excellent conſtitution none, I believe, ever paſſed an encomium upon it, without looking upon this as an eſſential part. To ſay that power may be abuſed will go to the removal of all power whatſoever, and then we muſt return (not *ad caſas* only but) to the fancied ſtate of nature, or the real ſtate of brutality. Be it remembered that the party who ſtickle for pretended liberty have ſometimes petitioned the king to refuſe his aſſent to ſome bill *they* did not like, and hiſſed and mobbed him if he refuſed to comply.

† A few years ago (juſt after a war which was thought to have ruined us) when ſome groſs abuſes in the king's kitchen

great

great diminution of the regal power; and the projected ſchemes of a place bill, ſeſſional parliaments,

were to be reformed, *œconomy* was the ſtanding jeſt of a facetious party. (See North Briton, &c. --- See alſo a print of lord Talbot grilling an ortolan over a farthing candle, &c.) but now the ſcene is ſhifted, and, heigh preſto, we find that, next to dear liberty, œconomy!--œconomy! is to be the goddeſs of our affections, and this by the management of the ſame party which had before ſo groſly abuſed her. However, let us take care we do not follow too cloſely the politic œconomy of Lear's daughters;

——— What, fifty followers?
Is it not well? what ſhould you need of more?
Yea, or ſo many? ſince both charge and danger
Speak 'gainſt ſo great a number. ———————
(For now I ſpy a danger) I entreat you
To bring but five and twenty, &c. (Lear, A. II.)

--- As to penſions I ſhall juſt give a ſmall ſketch of this matter, with a view to undeceive thoſe whom I moſt wiſh to ſerve --- the common people. Penſioners are, generally ſpeaking, 1ſt, Thoſe perſons (or their families) who have ſerved their country, or ſuffered for her ſake; 2dly, Artiſts, or learned and ingenious writers; 3dly, Peers without ſufficient income (this article much increaſed by the folly of the people in puſhing their favorites into that rank); 4thly, Genteel families in diſtreſs, or perſons reduced by ſome dreadful calamity. All this is proper and laudable; but the people are taught to ſay, are they not ſometimes granted to ſupport a party?- -- perhaps ſo, *good people* --- a miniſter may be ſo audacious as to remember his friends, but if you yourſelves *will* be drawn away for ever into factions, what elſe can you expect? what elſe do you deſerve? This may be allowable in ſome degree, and the beſt government in the world may by faction be driven to it much more than they could wiſh, It is liable to abuſes to be ſure, but theſe are contemptibly ſmall in compariſon of what they are repreſented to be. After all, the people themſelves,

and eſpecially an univerſal repreſentation, are any of them ſufficient to give it it's *coup de grace*. There is ſcarcely one of the royal prerogatives which has not been actually invaded, or violently threatened; ſuch as the appointing of miniſters, proroguing or diſſolving of parliaments, conferring of honors, making of war and peace &c. &c. Add to theſe the general diſregard which is ſhewn to the moſt ſolemn oaths;* the attempts to disfranchiſe all who may be ſuppoſed to be attached to the crown, while the moſt violent exertions of it's enemies paſs unnoticed; the aſtoniſhing arts and miſrepreſentations by which diſaffection is every where *diſſeminated*, and which it would baffle even the logarithms of modern ſtateſmen

for bad purpoſes, bribe much higher; they have penſioned Mr. Grattan, and they would moſt willingly have penſioned Mr. Arnold, had he remained an enemy to their country. All I mean is to ſhew *the people* that penſioners are not the idle drones that eat the honey of the induſtrious bees; and that there would not a mine of gold ſpring up to them if theſe were all ſet aſide, &c. If however œconomy be the *real* plan, why are much greater abuſes ſuffered? Why, we may aſk, were the great and wealthy prevented from building ſhips? or why was the country made to cry out for the keeping of Gibraltar, at an immenſe expence, when the ſurrendry would have been much more beneficial to us, and conſequently more honorable to the gallant Elliot?

* This is a topic which deſerves a much larger diſcuſſion than what I can give it at preſent. I ſhall only obſerve that, amidſt all the preſent diſaffection, the age has not had conſcience, or virtue enough to produce a ſingle non-juror; while as for ſuch as we might not improperly, I think, entitle *pan-jurors*, they may be met with in every corner of the kingdom.

to enumerate. All theſe I ſay, and many more, do indeed loudly call out for a reform, but not ſuch a reform as is only calculated to make bad worſe.*

Now ſince this is the caſe, and our own reſtleſneſs and diſcontent has reduced us to a ſtate more truly dangerous than an open war with all the powers of Europe, it might be no improbable conjecture to ſuppoſe that the French have agreed to a peace with us at preſent, merely to give us more ſcope and opportunity for ruining ourſelves. Britain, which is found to be impregnable to it's foreign foes, § is however too eaſily aſſailable by it's domeſtic flatterers and miſleaders. This the wary Frenchman could not but foreſee; nor ſhould I think it impoſſible that even America may have been influenced by ſimilar motives, and have thrown off it's allegiance to it's ſovereign, not becauſe he had *too much* power, but becauſe he had

* Rome frequently ſaved herſelf in the greateſt dangers by appointing a magiſtrate, with the moſt abſolute powers, to take care, ne quid detrimenti capiat reſpublica; but Britain, when in ſimilar circumſtances, for fear ſhe *ſhould* be ſaved, takes every method to ſtrip her chief magiſtrate of every power whatſoever.

§ We have been at war not, as is generally ſaid, with *four*, but with *ſix* great powers at once, the French, Spaniſh, Dutch, Americans, Hyder Ally, and *Ourſelves*, for it is certain there has been more hurt done to this kingdom on this ſide the water than in all the reſt of the world put together. It is pleaſant to obſerve that no ſooner is the peace made than it is found out that we are brim-full of reſources, though at the beginning of the war neither a man nor a ſhilling could be raiſed! I could not have thought that the war would have done us ſo much good.

too

too little. The colonies might juſtly ſuſpect that a government which could not defend itſelf at home would be little able to preſerve a diſtant continent in peace and proſperity; and they might wiſh for a haſty diſunion, leſt they ſhould be involved in thoſe diſtractions and miſeries which we are evidently bringing upon ourſelves.

I am fully convinced of an error which I had long entertained, namely, that a people will not rebel till they have ſome actual and ſubſtantial cauſe. Mr. Locke fell into the ſame miſtake when he, (naturally enough indeed at the firſt dawning of liberty) ſuppoſed that a good king might make himſelf beloved by his people, as a father by his children. (Locke, § 209). This is plauſible but fallacious. The ſtubborn argument of frequent experience will convince us, that as war begets poverty, poverty peace, &c. ſo proſperity produces diſaffection, diſaffection miſery, &c. or in other words, that the enjoyment of the greateſt political bleſſings will but render us impatient of the controul of that very government, by means of which they are acquired, and ſecured. So weak, ſo unaccountable is the heart of man! It has been known to bear with *ſlavery* for whole ages together, but *liberty* is what it ſcarce ever can put up with for one century throughout!

Such then is the *preſent national propenſity*; the more immediate conſequence of which will probably be the horrors of a civil war; but, ſuppoſing treaſon to prevail, have we not cauſe to apprehend that after

after groaning for ſome time under the heavieſt curſe of heaven the *reign of anarchy*, and perhaps fearing the inſecurity of our former ſtateof liberty, we may be driven at laſt to take refuge in the arms of arbritrary power? If our conſtitution, if our lives, our familes, our liberties, or our properties are at all worth preſerving, this aſſuredly is a matter of moſt ſerious concern. What then under providence is the remedy for this? I will ſpeak out — There muſt be an *effectual* party formed amongſt the *people themſelves* (for it is their cauſe) not only to defend the crown from further encroachments, but to *reſtore* it to that neceſſary weight and conſequence which it poſſeſſed in the reign of our *great deliverer* (who would never have ſubmitted to the preſent defalcations), of the *glorious Anne*, and of the *two Steadies*, as they are now affected to be called for reaſons which I need not mention.

Should however the popular rage (through a juſt judgment no doubt of the Almighty) be ſuffered to gain ground ſtill further, permit me to conſider, (ſince an Engliſhman you know may take any liberties with his king) what the beſt and moſt amiable monarch the world ever ſaw could poſſibly do in ſuch a caſe. The government it is plain would very ſoon become as impracticable as that of Maſſachuſet's bay --- Well then --- There ſeem to be but three modes of acting which the king --- (we talk freely of kings) --- could rationally adopt. The firſt is, that, abandoning all the good which by providence he is

ordained

ordained to promote, he ſhould ſuffer himſelf to be retained as a mere ſtate puppet, and indulged with a table, a carriage, and attendants, and with ſometimes a review, a ball, or a play, while, under ſanction of his name, his kingdom is torn with inteſtine factions, and each party by turns gains the aſcendency, and by turns is proſcribed, and perſecuted to utter ruin, for want of that conſtitution they had ſo wantonly forfeited. Thus the monarch may go on for a while *if ſuffered to exiſt*, * and this is one alternative. The

* I mean not to inſinuate that ſo horrible a thought can have occurred at preſent, but only that as things in ſuch a caſe muſt neceſſarily be getting worſe and worſe, it is impoſſible to tell where they will end. No parties can eſcape abuſe, ſo that we need not wonder at the report that at a late aſſociation-meeting, the following toaſt was drank "May every tyrant meet with the fate of Charles the Firſt," though the high rank of ſome, and the ſacred character of others who were preſent might ſurely have protected them from ſo improbable a ſlander. No tyrant, I believe, ever did or ever will meet with the fate of Charles the Firſt, they may be ſtabbed, ſhot, or torn in pieces, but to be murdered with the ſolemnity of a mock-trial was never, I apprehend, the fate of the guilty, though often of the innocent. Since however a certain kind of people (dux femina facti) are perpetually tearing up the wound of this unhappy prince: permit me to make a few obſervations on this ſubject. The death of Charles has been ſuppoſed to be favorable to liberty --- ſo far from it that it was neither intended to be ſo (for I have nothing to do with pretences -- I leave ſuch proofs to Dr. Price) nor was it ſo in fact. The blow that was aimed at Charles was meant to extinguiſh the laſt ſpark of liberty amongſt us; and the horror of this bloody tranſaction did in fact lay the foundation of ſuch a tyranny as had well nigh rivetted the chains of this kingdom for ever. But it may

next is, that provoked at length by the treachery and oppreſſion of his ungrateful ſubjects, he unſheaths the ſword in vindication of his much-injured and violated rights. But this ſcene is too ſhocking to be dwelt upon: I will drop a curtain over it.

Ne pueros coram populo Medea trucidet.

The only choice which is left, as I apprehend, to a prince in ſuch diſtreſsful circumſtances is, that when ſtripped of his own *unalienable* rights, he ſhould fairly abandon the defence of the *unalienable* rights of his ſubjects, by ſeceding from a government in which he can no longer anſwer the high ends of his ſacred office. Two of the greateſt deliverers the world ever ſaw, I mean K. William and Guſtavus Vaſa, ‖ refuſed to receive, or retain a crown, on ſlaviſh or

ſerve as a warning to princes --- In what reſpect? that they ſhould not be too haſty in making conceſſions? or too incautious in relying on the faith and honor of their *good* ſubjects? No, you will ſay, but leſt they ſhould prove tyrants --- were a tyrant really to ariſe we ſhould not, I fear, be ſo forward in making the application. However, let it be ever ſo good a warning to tyrants, it is full as good to one to a licentious and ungovernable people, ſince (N. B.) for the one wound of the unhappy Charles his country ſuffered millions. If ſomewhat too much was ſaid for him on a certain occaſion, this is no excuſe for his having the greateſt injuſtice done him on every other. The church of England is not infallible, and, times and circumſtances conſidered, this fault might ſurely have been pardoned: ſhe never attempted to make but one ſaint, and, in point of real goodneſs, he is perhaps worth all the Romiſh calendar put together.

‖ See his ſpeech to the ſtates aſſembled at Weſteras---(Vertot's Rev. of Sweden, part II.) where he tells them that they "are

disgraceful conditions; and here permit me to observe that the sovereign has by no means so much to dread as the subjects have, since, by this last method, he might secure his own tranquillity, though he must abandon his people to the effects of their own madness and folly.

Once more then let me address myself to *my equals*, and (if there be such things as subjects) my fellow-subjects *the people*, and most seriously warn them of that great truth that, THE CROWN AND THE PEOPLE MUST STAND OR FALL TOGETHER. Instead of tampering with the constitution, ‖ or being led about by noisy§ and interested declaimers, let them manifest a thankfulness to the Almighty for the political blessings they enjoy, and a loyalty to their king as the only earthly means of preserving them. We

grosly mistaken if they thought he mounted the throne as an actor mounts the stage, only to represent the person of a king: and, that he was willing to resign his authority if they thought he could not, without injustice, assume the power that was necessary to maintain it."

‖ The inscription on the tomb of a valetudinarian, as applied by a great statesman to the present subject, deserves to written in letters of gold --- "I WAS WELL --- I WOULD BE BETTER --- AND HERE I AM."

§ It is reported of a certain serjeant that his brother council could always tell whether he thought himself right or wrong. When he was right he quietly laid down the law, and said no more, but when he was wrong he would exclaim and vociferate "he was amazed! and astonished! it was monstrous! scandalous! &c." This may serve as an excellent key to all the party speeches and party writings of late years.

forget

forget every thing which is not conducive to our dearly-beloved ruin, or elſe we might have known that kings are ordained "to do juſtice and judgment, and to ſuccour the oppreſſed." They ſhould be placed in a rank and ſtation, ſo far tranſcending all others, as that they may be able impartially to execute the laws on all alike. Were it not for this power, the higher orders of men (in great and independent ſtates I mean) would be able, ſo long as they agreed, to trample under foot the middle and lower ranks of people, at their pleaſure, tho' when they choſe to quarrel we ſhould be honored with the priviledge of fighting their battles. But here I ſhall be told, that this is far from being the (oſtenſible) plan of Meſſrs. --- & --- &c. ſince what they mean is, that the people ſhould uſurp all power, and conſequently, all liberty to themſelves.‖ ---Oh fatal, fond, and ſubtle deluſion! Not contented with ſpurning at the laws of God and our country, we are to outrage thoſe of nature and reaſon too. Power and property, it ſeems, are to be for ever diſunited; the weak and ignorant are to turn inſtructors of the learned and intelligent; and the great council of the nation is to be from

‖ Power in the hands of every body is power in the hands of nobody; ſo that what we may call a pure (or rather impure) democracy ſeems impracticable and therefore, we may ſuppoſe, cannot ſeriouſly be intended: and indeed it has been ſaid that ſome perſons have thrown off the maſk and openly avowed that "the Britiſh government is and ought to be an ariſtocracy," but I will not vouch for the truth of this.

henceforth no better than the errand-boys of a miſguided populace, to bear their imperious mandates to their ſubject ſovereign, and ſtill more ſubject lords! Who knows not, if he will but deign to think, that as ſoon as the people have broke looſe from wholeſome and neceſſary reſtraint, ‖ the *worſt*, which muſt always be the *greateſt* part of them, will immediately fly off into every violence, and as we know they will not want leaders, they may be able to ſpread terror and deſtruction on every ſide? The lawleſs multitude indeed will poſſeſs *licentiouſneſs* in perfection, (and ſo will the tools of oppreſſion in every kind of deſpotic government) but to the honeſt and peaceable citizen no ſlavery can be more terrible than this. Hence then, upon the whole, we have every poſſible reaſon to be convinced that that heavenly mandate, "SUBMIT TO ORDINANCES FOR THE LORD'S SAKE" is ſo far from tending to ſlaviſhneſs, that it is, in fact, the true and only ſolid foundation of human liberty.

I ſhall only add here that we might, I think, derive an uſeful leſſon on the preſent ſubject from a late great

‖ I have ſomewhere read of a ſet of chymiſts who were much elated with the expectation of diſcovering an *univerſal diſſolvent*, till they were unluckily aſked what ſort of a veſſel they intended to put it into when they had found it? Juſt ſuch an univerſal diſſolvent is the *liberty* which we are now in purſuit of. It would be a folly to think of containing or comprehending it within any poſſible ſyſtem of juriſprudence becauſe comprehenſion implies conſtraint, and while there remains even the ſhadow of a con-

national

national calamity. The cataſtrophe of the Royal George might ſerve as a "ſign to this generation." This we know was owing to an adventrous raſhneſs in raiſing it's bottom beyond it's juſt and natural poize; and what have we to expect if we perſiſt in *ſubverting* the political veſſel in which we are all embarked, by a ſimilar operation, but that the whole crew, together with the great and amiable commander, muſt be overwhelmned in one common and univerſal ruin?

ſtraint from any government or laws, there will not be wanting perſons (I mean if they are encouraged) who will ſtill be crying out for the *liberty* of the ſubject, *unalienable* rights, &c. and all the powers of arithmetic will be called forth to prove that we are not yet arrived, at the ſummit and perfection of freedom!

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE "Candid Suggeſtions, in Eight Letters to Soame Jenyns Eſq; on the reſpective ſubjects of his Diſquiſitions, lately publiſhed, with ſome remarks on the Anſwer to his ſeventh Diſquiſition, reſpecting the principles of Mr. Locke," was publiſhed in Auguſt 1782, for T. Lowndes, Fleet-ſtreet. Of theſe Letters the following is the Seventh which is here reprinted with ſome ſlight additions and corrections. I have recited the Title at length, as above, becauſe it was by accident imperfectly advertized in ſome of the London Papers.---As to the *Anſwer* here noticed, it having been ſuppoſed to come from a *very reſpectable quarter*, (tho' now diſowned) I ſhall probably take a future opportunity of paying it ſome further attention.

LETTER VII.

To Soame Jenyns Esq;

On his Diſquiſition reſpecting "Government and Civil Liberty."

Sir,

THERE having been an expreſs anſwer publiſhed to this Diſquiſition, which ſeems to contain the creed of your political opponents, I ſhall endeavour to aſcertain the truth by comparing and moderating between you.

I am far from thinking with you that nothing can be added on political ſubjects "which can afford either inſtruction or entertainment" ſince there never was a period, I fear, in which *proper* diſcuſſions of this ſort were more neceſſary. This indeed is dangerous ground --- for politicians are infinitely more a genus irritabile than poets, and he will be little likely to pleaſe either party, who is free to blame both, and will go lengths with neither,

While tories call him whig and whig a tory.

You ſay "there have been principles lately diſſeminated with unuſual induſtry which are abſurd, falſe, miſchievous, as inconſiſtent with common ſenſe as with

all human ſociety;" This your anſwerer warmly retorts; and here let me juſt hint, that the word *diſſeminate* ought not, I think, to refer to the writings of ingenious men, but to the induſtrious propagation of principles, by means of emiſſaries, paragraphs, hand-bills, &c.

The principles you oppoſe are the following,

1ſt. That all men are born equal.

2d. That all men are born free.

3d. That all government is derived from the people

4th. That all government is a compact between the governors and the governed.

5th. That no government ought to laſt any longer than it continues to be of equal advantage to the two contracting parties, that is, to the governed as to the governors.

As to the firſt, --- "Men," you ſay, "are not born equal in point of ſtrength, health, beauty, riches, or fine parts, &c." to which your anſwerer properly enough replies, that this is not what his party means, but a natural equality as to *ſovereignty* (but have not ſtrength, genius, &c. a natural tendency to produce and eſtabliſh ſovereignty?) --- they mean, he ſays, that ſtate wherein all power and juriſdiction is reciprocal, no one having more than another --- that freedom from ſubordination, which, antecedent to civil compact, belongs to every individual of our ſpecies, who is arrived at years of diſcretion." There may have been many ſtates antecedent to civil compact, but as to there being a ſtate previous to ſubordination I can only ſay, *Gentle ſhepherd tell me where!*

Suppoſing

Suppoſing the above to be, as I believe it is, a tolerably juſt epitome of the Lockian ſyſtem, I cannot but ſuſpect that it implies a contradiction in terms, ſince this is to be a ſtate *prior* to ſubordination in general, and yet *poſterior* to that ſubordination which the firſt compact-makers were under during their minority.* This would lead us to the patriarchal ſcheme of Sir Robert Filmer, which however is acknowledged by Mr. Locke, ‖ though the ſhocking principles deduced from it had been ſo nobly and effectually refuted by him.

This ſtate of nature could only have exiſted among ſavages, and ſo it is underſtood, as appears by Mr. Locke's appeal (whether right or wrong) for the reality of it, to certain tribes of half-brutes † in America. Suppoſing then that there was a ſtate of nature, and that two or three men-ſavages, diſtinctly created, were accidentally to meet in it, without language, or any ideas about government, might we not conjec-

* Query, --- When did men come of age, or arrive at years of diſcretion in a ſtate of nature?

‖ See Locke on Civ. Gov. § 74, &c. and § 105, &c. The above work has ſo far *got the ſtart of the majeſtic world*, as that it is eſteemed a kind of literary treaſon to doubt any thing it contains. But this great man was far from meaning to eſtabliſh an intellectual deſpotiſm, or preclude others for ever from the exerciſe of their *unalienable* right of reaſon. In his preface he invites the candid critic, and profeſſes himſelf open to conviction. Would to God his principles had been thoroughly canvaſſed twenty years ago!

† I ſee no reaſon why theſe degenerated, degraded human beings might not *originally* have had ſubordination.

ture, that one of them by his air, preſence, eye, &c. might impreſs the others with an idea of his ſuperiority, ſo as that he would naturally lead the way, and the others as naturally follow? This is ſurely poſſible, and Heaven in ſuch a caſe might provide that it ſhould be real. Monteſquieu is of opinion, that in a ſtate of nature "every man would fancy himſelf *inferior* inſtead of being ſenſible of his equality."*

Whatever ſuch original people might do, being ſavages, cannot be any precedent to us; if they formed ſocieties, it would be enough to ſet us againſt them; but the truth is, men were *not* originally ſavages; ‖ *ergo cadit queſtio.* --- Now had there been ſuch a natural equality, as is here ſuppoſed, and the inferences from it expedient, and conducive to the well-being of ſuch a creature as man, I muſt be permitted to think, that the great Lord of nature would have given us as clear and explicit an information of it's reality, as he has of the rights of ſovereignty, and the duty of ſovereigns.

* Spirit of Laws, Book I. Chap. 2.

‖ We know but little of the firſt patriarchs, but from what is recorded of them, can any one doubt whether Adam, or Noah had as much good ſenſe or good manners as ourſelves? and to deſcend a little lower, let any man who has a head to underſtand, or a heart to feel, read the 23d and 24th chapters of Geneſis, and then tell me whether the true politeneſs contained in them was ever exceeded in the moſt brilliant court of Chriſtendom. — *Whatſoever is more than theſe cometh of evil* — or, at leaſt, tends to it.

II. That

II. That all men are born free. --- Here, Sir, you are very facetious * about our impriſonment in the womb, our ſwadling-cloths, nurſes, ſchool-maſters, &c. ‡ What is here meant however is a natural right to freedom, derived from a ſtate of equality previous to ſubordination; and this, as your Anſwerer acknowledges, muſt ſtand or fall with the laſt article.

To deny us ſuch natural rights as would be exceſſive, and incompatible with our happineſs, is very conſiſtent with the goodneſs of God; but then he has endowed us with ſenſe, and ſpirit enough to ſecure to ourſelves as many *civil* rights as are neceſſary and ſafe. In this ſenſe it is that we of this land are indeed *born* ſuperlatively *free*. This is the true ſubſtantial liberty to which we are entitled by our birth-right, and for this we are indebted, under Heaven, to that excellent conſtitution, which it is our duty to guard from all encroachments, whether of the monarch, or the

* This your Anſwerer is angry at, becauſe "the ſubject is of great importance" but Mr. Locke himſelf can be comical ſometimes (B. I. § 6. — where he talks of Sir R. Filmer's making his obeiſance to the *arcana imperii* — making his leg to thoſe learned men, who did not ſee ſo far into the matter as himſelf, &c.) and ſhould the greateſt genius on earth write a treatiſe founded on a ſtate of nature, which is — nobody knows what — he will ſcarcely avoid, now and then, laying himſelf open to the wicked wits. (Compare Civ. Gov. § 27 and 28, with Triſtram Shandy, Vol. III. C. 34.)

‡ Mr. Locke himſelf ſays, (§ 55) "Children, I confeſs, are not born in this full ſtate of equality, though they are born to it. (at what period?) The bonds of ſubjection to their parents are like the ſwadling clothes, &c."

people. --- " With a great ſum" ſaid the chief captain, " obtained I this [political] freedom," (vaſtly inferior to our own) --- and Paul ſaid " But I was FREE BORN." * Of this ſort of freedom and it's priviledges this great apoſtle frequently boaſted; but there is not, I believe, the ſmalleſt hint, either here or elſewhere, in the only book which could have deſcribed our primæval ſtate, of any ſuch natural ante-compact freedom as Mr. Locke ſuppoſes; whence it ſhould ſeem that there is no genuine liberty above that of a brute, ‡ but what is ſupported by ſome authority; and Mr. Locke owns ‖ that " in *all ſtates* of created beings, *capable of laws*, where there is no law there is no freedom."

That we are naturally ſubjects, without our own explicit conſent, ſeems aſſerted by Mr. Hooker, as quoted by Mr. Locke. † That children ſhould be born *outlaws*, (and thereby have no right to protection) in order that they may have a power of conſenting, or not, to be governed when they come of age, ſeems ſtrangely unneceſſary; for in this caſe they muſt

* Acts xxii, 28.

‡ Mr. Locke ſays (§ 63) that " natural freedom is grounded on our having *reaſon*," How then can brutes have it at all? or how can men have it equally when their reaſon is ſo different? The truth ſeems to be, that ſome ſavages bordering on brutes, have a ſort of natural freedom, but reaſonable beings have a ſuitably ſuperior kind of liberty, viz. the *civil*.

‖ — § 57.

† — § 134.

explicitly

explicitly give up ſuch right when of age, ſince no ſtate would ſuffer them to demur. To have univerſal regiſters for this purpoſe would be endleſs, and *evil doers* will never willingly conſent to that which is expreſly inſtituted for their *puniſhment*. *

III. That all government is (originally) derived from the people --- This, like the reſt, is impoſſible to be aſcertained: We know of no other original author of ſocieties, but God himſelf: † but what is the doctrine intended to be derived from it? The people, as having *intruſted* the magiſtrate, may reſiſt or depoſe him whenever they *apprehend* he invades their rights: ‡ So then the magiſtrate, who is the intruſted party, muſt never reſiſt the people, if he *apprehends*, or is ever ſo *certain* that they have invaded *his* rights. This will hardly be approved of by any one who recollects that the rights on both ſides are equally eſſential to the ſalus populi. ‖ Mr. Locke obſerves (§134) "the *legiſlative* is ſacred and

* I. Pet. ii, 14.

† Eccluſ. xvii, 17.

‡ Civ. Gov. (§ 240) All this would be proper if it were true, as Mr. Locke ſays (§ 209) that a good king may make himſelf beloved by his ſubjects, as a father by his children." This alas is too often contradicted by hiſtory and experience. A ſeries of proſperity will make people rebel even againſt their God — Were mankind perfect, ſuch ſyſtems would be excellent, but then — what need of any government at all? (See above p. 22.)

‖ Surely the hand of providence is diſcernible in our *not* being permitted to know our primæval ſtate, which might afford a pretence for intolerable pride and inſolence, either in the one party or the other.

unalterable

unalterable in the hands where the community have once placed it;" (this is saying a great deal) and Mr. Hooker, as *unfortunately* quoted by him (§ 135,) tells us that "laws politic are never framed as they ſhould be, unleſs preſuming the will of man to be inwardly obſtinate, rebellious, and averſe from all obedience to the ſacred laws of his own nature: in a word, unleſs preſuming man to be in regard of his depraved mind, little better than a wild beaſt, &c." If *the people* be half ſo bad as this, ſuch a body is not very fit to be conſtituted the *King of Kings*.

IV. That all government is a compact between the governors and the governed --- If this be meant *originally*, and in a ſtate of nature, enough has been ſaid of it already. Mr. Locke (tho' not very conſiſtently with ſome parts of his book) ſeems to give up this original compact, where he ſays, (§ 94,) "Perhaps at firſt ſome excellent man might have ſo far got the pre-eminency, that, by a kind of *natural authority*, the chief rule devolved on him by *tacit* conſent, without any other caution but their aſſurance of his uprightneſs and wiſdom, *&c.*" Suppoſing then this *excellent man*, like another Orpheus, to have civilized the rude people into regular government, might we not ſay, that government proceeded rather from *him* than *them?* Mr. Locke however is perfectly right in ſaying, That ſuch an arbitrary ſway would ſoon degenerate, and become intolerable, and hence the neceſſity for thoſe regulations which have from time to time taken place in well ordered ſtates, and to which we owe

owe the *civil*, which is the only intelligible or desirable liberty --- Call such regulations compacts, and the difficulty vanishes.

To this liberty which is subsequent (not antecedent) to compact, every reasonable creature has an undoubted, tho' not an *unalienable*, right. Where this is not claimed it must be owing to the weakness and degeneracy of the people; * and where it is enjoyed in it's full extent, the great danger is, lest it should be over-strained, in which case there is scarce a doubt but that ere long it must be forfeited, and --- lost. Our great political duty then is to defend our own constitution, which, tho' not perfect in theory, is in fact (if I may be pardoned the equivoque) the most admirably *compacted* of any upon the face of the earth.

V. That no government ought to last any longer than it continues to be of *equal* advantage to the two contracting parties, that is, to the governed as the governors --- The word *equal* is ambiguous, and you have chose to take it in it's wrong sense, as if it meant, That every one was to have an equal share of wealth, power, &c. If we substitute the word *respective* or *proportionable* instead of *equal*, then, as referring to cases of extreme necessity, the proposition

* There is a difference between the manner in which some monarchs have been treated, and the style of address made use of to the Persian tyrant, of which some curious examples may be seen in the Chevalier Chardin, (chap. 24,) as, for instance, the following conclusion of an instrument by one of his ministers, —"May my soul, and that of all his other slaves, be sacrificed to the dust of his blessed feet!"

I fear

I fear is undeniable. --- Nothing certainly but ſyſtem, or party could have made a man of Mr. Locke's philanthropy argue with ſuch coolneſs, and unconcern, about the moſt horrific condition of human nature --- a civil war. This he conſtantly calls *an appeal to heaven*, tho' he ſurely might have called it much more truly and emphatically an *appeal to hell*. The times indeed in which he lived may be an apology for this, but might not theſe very times have furniſhed him with a different ſyſtem? Might they not have ſuggeſted, that, where the people are not the aggreſſors, but are really, and ſenſibly aggrieved, they will generally have temper and firmneſs enough to procure the moſt effectual redreſs without the neceſſity of blood-ſhed? *

The above ſketch (which is all I could effect at preſent) needs no apology. I admire the great philoſopher, and as far as his principles are conſiſtent with his motto, the ſalus populi, I am moſt cordially with him---The danger is leſt we be miſled by *great names*; ſince, in fact, the errors of the greateſt geniuſes are proportionably greater than thoſe of other men. To refute an arbitrary ſyſtem, and teach the world that there are caſes in which a tyrant may be oppoſed, was

* The coolneſs with which the revolution was effected is ſomewhat evidenced by the following. On the king's being informed from time to time, of the defection of his lords to the prince of Orange, prince George of Denmark, who attended him, was uſed to lift up his hands and eyes and exclaim — *Eſt il poſſible?* — At laſt it was told the king that prince George himſelf was gone over; nay then, ſaid he, if *Eſt il poſſible* is gone, it is time for me to go too.

a noble

a noble deſign, and it has had it's full effect in theſe kingdoms; for who is there in them who believes in the arbitrary ſyſtem of Sir Robert Filmer, or doubts that there are caſes in which a tyrant may be oppoſed? † But if theſe principles are found to be ſuch as would arm what is called the *people* with thoſe very terrors, and that

——— Right divine of doing wrong,

of which kings have been deprived. Such, in ſhort, as would give the multitudes, who are ever deſirous of diſturbing commonwealths, a *natural, unalienable* right to do ſo, they are ſuch as I muſt think Mr. Locke, if alive at preſent, would himſelf reject ‡ --- Whether theſe or ſimilar principles are reſerved by Heaven as inſtruments of vengeance on a rebellious people, Heaven only knows!

I ſhall now make a few remarks (out of the many I originally intended) firſt on your Anſwerer, and then on yourſelf --- He complains "that the door of St. James's is ſhut in the face of the Whigs," and yet "he hopes, and is perſuaded, that the Houſe of Hanover will keep at an aweful diſtance from the throne, men profeſſing principles which levelled with

† This kings are not ignorant of. It reflects honor on the preſent king of Denmark, that on being ſhewn the portrait of Oliver Cromwell in Sidney college library, he exclaimed, *Il fait me peur!*

‡ Could this great and amiable man have lived to ſee the ill effects of his ſyſtem, as he did the good ones, he would have wept like Johnny Gay, at the unforeſeen conſequences of his own ſuperior genius.

the duſt the Houſe of Stewart." (This is a wiſh to ſhut the door of St. James's in the face of ſomebody) If we add to this, --- men profeſſing principles, which, under Cromwell, levelled with the duſt the rights of the people, --- there can be no objection. Should Tories degenerate into Jacobites, or Whigs into Republicans, they can neither of them have any buſineſs there.

It is the glory of the preſent reign that the door of St. James's has been thrown open to honeſt men of either party. In fact, there ought to be ſome of both near the throne; the one party to prevent the ſovereign from yielding up, thro' deception, or timidity, his own eſſential rights; and the other to prevent his being tempted thro' ambition to invade thoſe of his people. --- In every mixt government, like ours, there muſt be two ſuch parties as we are ſpeaking of; and a wiſe monarch, who knows that his own rights and thoſe of his people mutually ſupport each other, will naturally be a compound of both. † It is a miſtake to ſay that the Houſe of Hanover was eſtabliſhed on Whig-principles --- It was eſtabliſhed on *general conſtitutional* principles, which are a mixture of Whig and Tory; and which have the eſſence of both, excluſive of Jacobitiſm on

† His preſent majeſty is as much a whig in every good ſenſe of the word as any man in his dominions, of which the conceſſions under the nullum tempus, and Grenville acts, &c. and eſpecially the renunciation of the power of the crown over the judges are inconteſtible proofs.

the

the one ſide, and Republicaniſm on the other. The Whigs indeed brought about the Revolution, but the Tories modified it; and ſince that, the Whigs have kept out a Popiſh Tyrant, and the Tories have kept out a ſtill more tyrannical Republic, or Ariſtocracy.

A due contention, and equipoiſe of the above parties, which are eſſential to the conſtitution, muſt be kept up in the nation at large, but eſpecially in the Houſe of Commons, or we are utterly undone. It is a grand and capital error to ſuppoſe that the Commons, becauſe appointed by the people, are the guardians of their rights only, and not equally ſo of the rights of the crown. They are choſen by both parties, and ought to partake of the ſpirit of both.

A ſenſe of the dangerous violence too natural to contending parties will induce moderate men to form an independent corps of obſervation, ſo that tho' intereſt or prejudice will bias many, yet ſuppoſing one third of the Houſe of Commons to be influenced by government (no matter how), and another third by oppoſition, will not this throw the balance where it ought to be, that is, into the hands of the independent party? This parliamentary conſtitution we now poſſeſs, and may preſerve, if we will avoid innovations. Our political ſafety then does not depend upon whether a few decayed burroughs † continue to

† Permit me to ſay a word or two on the faſhionable outcry of the preſent year (1782—ſtill unhappily continued.) Small bur-

ſend members, but whether we can keep up this due *equilibrium* in the ſenate. Let me here repeat † That "every honeſt man ſhould oppoſe whatever party ſeems likely to gain an undue aſcendency." The ſteerſman and rowers will be unable to ſave the political veſſel if the paſſengers refuſe to *trim.* ‡

But there is ſtill, Sir, an heavier accuſation againſt you, ſince by ſaying That "nothing ſo compleatly diſqualifies a man for the community of the bleſſed as a factious and turbulent diſpoſition" you have

roughs may be favourable, nay poſſibly neceſſary, to the maintaining of the above *balance* — if ſo, to deſtroy them would be to deſtroy ourſelves. At leaſt, they may, under proper regulations be ſerviceable, by admitting men of genius and abilities, who may not have ſufficient county or city intereſt. The members returned by the lords of Newton or Old Sarum, repreſent me, and every individual in the empire, as truly (and why not as honeſtly, and as ably?) as thoſe choſen in London or in Yorkſhire. But no man it ſeems is *free* that has not a vote — this is ſo far from true, that many avoid being electors that they may preſerve their freedom. — Hence then we are told every *individual* ſhould have a vote — even the poor intellects of thoſe whoſe heads are meant to be ſet a madding by this device, may ſurely be capable of diſcovering it's abſurdity.

† See Candid Suggeſtions p. 102.

‡ This digreſſion will, I hope, be excuſed when it is conſidered that we are threatened with ſome of the moſt ruinous, as well as the moſt plauſible innovations that ever the heart of man conceived. Could I preſume that theſe, and other ſuch reflections ſyſtematically eſtabliſhed, could conduce to the preſervation of my country, they ſhould be heartily at it's ſervice. (See Appendix) For my own part I am by no means a *Michael Caſſio*, a good arithmetician, ſo that I ſhould never think of computing politics by the new-faſhioned algebraical method.

ſhut

ſhut, it ſeems, "the gates of heaven alſo againſt the Whigs, the Revolutioniſts, and even againſt St. Paul and the Apoſtles, becauſe they turned the world upſide down." Are then the Whigs factious and turbulent? Were our glorious deliverers under King William factious and turbulent? I will undertake to prove that they were the very reverſe. But as to St. Paul and the Apoſtles, it is ſurely amazing that any one could be ignorant that what is here ſaid of them was the malicious ſlander of their enemies, frequently diſclaimed, and as frequently diſproved.

As to thoſe diſturbers of commonwealths, who would deſtroy the equipoiſe of ſtates, and who ſow the ſeeds of diſcontent, that they may themſelves reap the harveſt of confuſion, --- how their lot will be caſt in a future being is what it more behoves them to conſider than us to ſay. † Sir Robert Filmer admits, That a Tyrant cannot be ſaved in a future ſtate: Shall we then become more abject flatterers of the people, and their demagogues, than he dared to be even of kings? —— O fye, fye, --- No!

† "This I am ſure, whoever, either ruler or ſubject, by force (fraud, declamation, &c.) goes about to invade the rights of either prince or people, and lays the foundation for *overturning* the conſtitution and frame of any *juſt government*, is highly guilty of the greateſt crime, I think, a man is capable of, being to anſwer for all thoſe miſchiefs of blood, rapin and deſolation, which the breaking to pieces of government brings on a country. And he who does it, is juſtly to be eſteemed the common enemy and peſt of mankind, and is to be treated accordingly." Mr. Locke, § 230.

After

After ſo long a neglect, Sir, I fear I ſhall be able to pay *you* but little attention under the preſent article. The extremes of *your* party are as reprehenſible as thoſe of the other, tho' in the preſent juncture not quite ſo alarming. In a Diſquiſition, otherwiſe juſt and beautiful, you have yourſelf deviated into party. † tho' not ſo much as your Anſwerer; and of this it now becomes proper that I ſhould produce an inſtance or two. To ſay that governments in general are the offspring of force or fraud is what I can by no means allow; they owe their origin, under Providence, to the nature of man and a ſort of inſtinctive exertion of human prudence for the regulation of this neceſſary condition. *It is not good for man to be alone*, and if not alone, it is unnatural for him to be without ſubordination. ‡ Many revolutions, and preſent eſtabliſhments have been owing to force or fraud, but theſe are not the origin of governments.

Becauſe we know of no *original* rights which men had to give up, you argue, that "Compacts are repugnant to the nature of government, whoſe * eſſence

† I ſhall have occaſion in my next to addreſs you on the liberty of the ſubject, which may be an apology for my ſaying ſo little about it here. (See Candid Suggeſtions, p. 171, &c.)

‡ Whenever the loweſt of the people, have been enabled, for their ſins, not to correct, but to overturn a government, they have almoſt always erected a greater tyranny in it's ſtead. Such a *poſture* of affairs is to the body politic, as ſtanding on the head is to the body natural; one part or other muſt ſtill be uppermoſt.

* It is eſſential to government to diſpenſe honors and rewards, as well as puniſhments; and, like the fairy, it muſt not always

is

is compulſion." This is far from being true, for no ſooner were there in the world the firſt rudiments of government; but there were the principles of civil liberty alſo: theſe are twin-brothers, and if one, in ſome countries, oppreſſes the other it is unnatural and baſe.

To ſay that the eſſence of government is compulſion, is an alarming ſentence. This would be diſtributing the world into conquered provinces, which is an idea at which every generous mind, eſpecially that of an Engliſhman, † revolts with horror. The truth is, that every government is by the very nature of things armed with a kind of internal compulſion to ſupport it's own authority, and reſtrain offenders, according to written laws; but then it does not ſupport itſelf by force in deſpite of the good and orderly part of the community, for whenever *they* are ſet againſt it there is a certainty that it has perverted the ends of it's inſtitution.

You ſay "Every governor is in the ſituation of a goaler, whoſe very office ariſes from the criminality of thoſe over whom he preſides; theſe ſometimes

be ſuppoſed to pinch and bite, but ſometimes to drop a teſter in the ſhoe.

† Biſhop Burnet in a paſtoral letter A. D. 1589, having ſlightly mentioned the right of conqueſt amongſt other rights of his patron, both houſes took the alarm, and voted it to be burnt by the common hangman. Some influence however ſeems to have been gained to the vote in the lower houſe, by a pun on the author's name, the younger members calling out, "Oh! *burn it, burn it*, to be ſure."

ſuffer

ſuffer much from the abuſe of his power, but they would ſuffer more from their mutual ill-uſage if unreſtrained." Here your ſatire is too general to be juſt: the magiſtrate is appointed not to reſtrain *all*, but to defend the good and virtuous from thoſe who are void of principle.

In concluſion let me particularly remark, That it is not from the "ſuperior wiſdom of our neighbours," but from the extreme increaſing wickedneſs of this nation, that we are to apprehend the moſt fatal conſequences. If we look to the firſt cauſe of the fall of empires, it will not be found to be the power of external, nor the artifice of internal enemies, but the wrath of an offended Deity at the national defection from that King whoſe title is *ſupreme*, and everlaſting: What the preſent proſpect is I am ſhocked to think, and unable to deſcribe. Nothing I fear but a national reformation can preſerve us long! Our aſtoniſhing diſſoluteneſs of morals, and neglect of ſacred things; our extreme hatred and animoſities; our intolerable commercial impoſitions, and very great private (tho' not public) tyrannies and oppreſſions, *&c. &c.* theſe are the *Helen* thro' whoſe detention our political Troy will be in danger of burning; ſo that I fear we may too well apply to our own ſituation the warning of the Propheteſs,

"Cry, Trojans, cry! a Helen and a woe:
"Cry, cry! Troy burns, or elſe let Helen go." ‡

‡ *Troilus and Creſſida, Act II. Sc. 2.*

APPENDIX.

WHEN I firſt publiſhed the above I did not indeed expect that it would be played off *con amore* by the Monthly Reviewers. The account however which they gave of it † was ſo ſtrangely unfavorable, that I thought myſelf loudly called upon to juſtify what I had ſaid; and in order to this I tranſmitted to them a kind of amicable challenge, addreſſed to ſome individuals amongſt the favorers of innovation, whom I looked upon to be men of real worth and honor. I ſhall here take the liberty to give the ſubſtance of that paper (which the Reviewers declined inſerting, tho' I muſt own, with much politeneſs and civility) and to ſubjoin a few obſervations on the alarming plan for altering the eſtabliſhed conſtitution with reſpect to repreſentation.

† See Monthly Review for November 1782. I ſhall take no further notice at preſent of what the Reviewers have here ſaid, becauſe I have ſome thoughts of making it the baſis of an addreſs to themſelves, in which the principles in queſtion will be more fully inveſtigated: Since this, however, (I ſpeak it to their credit) they ſeem to have ſhewn themſelves open to conviction. (See Monthly Review for Feb. 1783, p. 181, Art. 26.)

After having obſerved that "the period ſeems to be very faſt approaching in which it may be as neceſſary, as honorable, and *poſſibly* as dangerous too, to defend the rights of the crown as it was to vindicate thoſe of the people in the times of Algernon Sidney." I took occaſion to aſſert that "the preſent ſcheme (whoever ſtruck it out) of ſhaking up the dregs and ſediments of the conſtitution in order to obtain a *pure* repreſentation, is not only againſt law, but againſt nature, againſt the goſpel, and againſt the happineſs and ſafety of every individual. That it would be ruinous both to the city ‡ and the country --- to the great and to the little --- to the governors and the governed. That it would tend to deſtroy not only the remains of virtue and morality, but even the *liberty* and *independence* too which is to be found amongſt the lower claſs of people. That it is inconſiſtent with the welfare of a populous, manufacturing, and commercial nation; as well as with the ſervice both of the navy, and army; and finally that beſides the deſtruction and miſery it muſt neceſſarily occaſion

‡ The city, on which this would fall the heavieſt, is already by far the moſt repreſented, and has the leaſt occaſion to be ſo. Not only every member of both houſes has an intereſt in it thro' his part-reſidence, but almoſt every citizen, above the canaille, has a vote or influence in one or more counties, which is not the caſe vice verſâ. It's different ſtreets have not, like the provinces, any jarring or diſtinct intereſts on account of different produce, manufactures, &c. and few acts need be made to ſuit it's particular purpoſes. The city may be divided into one great palace, and one great warehouſe, the palace will take care of itſelf, the warehouſe conſiſts of goods already taken care of before they came there, &c. &c.

at

at home, it would amount to a plain dereliction of *all* our foreign poſſeſſions, if indeed we have not already virtually abandoned them by our approbation of American reſiſtance."---On theſe topics I profeſſed myſelf ready to enter into a friendly controverſy with any gentleman of liberal ſentiments who ſhould entertain a different opinion. *

As for the real grievances and oppreſſions which *the people* labour under they are certainly very conſiderable, and ſhould a true patriot ariſe who would endeavour to redreſs theſe, I ſhould be ſtrongly tempted to give a challenge of a different kind, and to ſay to him, as Longſword Earl of Saliſbury did formerly to the Count d' Artois, " Whereſoever your foot ſhall be ſet in this cauſe, mine ſhall be as far as yours. " ‖ The common people have a right to liberty, but not to dominion. My warmeſt wiſh is for *their* happineſs, and tho' I would not have them, literally ſpeaking, *give law from beds of ſtraw*, yet I am clearly of opinion, that the only juſt criterion of the welfare of a ſtate is the proſperity, not of the higher but, of the lower orders of men.

* It may be proper to obſerve that what is here ſaid was grounded on the principles advanced by Major Cartwright in his " Give us our rights " (the only pamphlet of his which I have ſeen) I am aware indeed that his plan is not adopted in it's full extent at preſent, but we know not how ſoon it may be ; and I wiſh to intimate that every tendency towards it muſt be hurtful and dangerous in many reſpects.

‖ Knolles's Hiſt. of the Turks, page 104. — Fuller's Holy Wars, &c.

Amongſt

Amongſt the various plans which have been ſupported of late years by means of aſſociations, committees, correſpondencies, petitions, &c. --- ſuch as *ſhort parliaments*, the ſure ſource of diſtractions at home, and contempt abroad, --- *a place bill*, under which no (honeſt) miniſtry could ever ſurvive it's honey-moon, &c. &c. --- there is none, perhaps, more truly dangerous than the preſent one of an equal repreſentation. --- We have, it ſeems, at this time, (not a king but) a conſtitution *de jure* and a conſtitution *de facto*. The *right* of lineal ſucceſſion is *unalienable*, ſaid James II. formerly, --- the *right* of univerſal repreſentation is *unalienable*, ſay the people now. That which is *de facto* is now, as heretofore, found to be ſafe, effectual, and excellent; while that which is *de jure* may eaſily be ſhewn to be ruinous, and intolerable.

The repreſentation is now adequate and efficient--- equal it cannot poſſibly be, --- and indeed if it could, yet, like the poll-tax, it might be ſaid to be only the more unjuſt on that account. But were this ever ſo eaſy to be done, it does not follow that it would be expedient. A late writer ſpeaking of the vaſt multitudes who had votes in the comitia at Rome, ſays, "Could the moſt remote conception of juſtice, reaſon, or public good ever pervade ſuch a body?" * By ſuch legal mobs, not only the wiſdom of parliament would be effectually overruled, † (which ſeems to

* Eſſay on the Colonization of free ſtates of antiquity, p. 109.

† This reminds me of an anſwer of Lewis XII. at the time of the famous league of Cambray, who being told of the danger he

be

be principally intended) but, the ſuffrages of all the intelligent part of the community, who alone, by the ſpirit of the conſtitution, have a right to vote, would become of little or no conſequence, and force * and corruption would carry all before them. It is obvious indeed that many advantages have ariſen to individuals from the right of voting, but theſe are what need not be repined at, when we conſider that they may fill people with vain hopes, and divert them from better purſuits; while on the other hand, ſince this right is frequently a burthen, and ſometimes the greateſt curſe, ‖ the public in general will ſcarcely ſubmit to have it forced upon them, whether they will or no.

incurred from the *great wiſdom* of the Venetians, replied, "I will overwhelm their wiſdom by a multitude of fools." (Gen. Dict. Vol. VI. p. 262.)

* How would they like, for inſtance, to ſee a ſhip's crew, or a regiment, marching together (for they could not be perpetually diſbanded) in order to give a *free* vote for their reſpective commanders?

‖ How many have owed their ruin, or even their deaths, to the misfortune of having a vote? Communities, as well as individuals, may be injured by this circumſtance, eſpecially great ones, ſo that it ſeems lucky, in this reſpect, that ſo many ſmall places are inveſted with a power of chooſing. — In one of the laſt reigns, as a great man (I think Sir George Treby) drove one evening into a conſiderable market town, he was through ſome miſtake inſulted by the populace: Finding that he was highly offended, the principal people in the place waited upon him to make apologies, "I will hear nothing, ſaid he, I am determined to ruin you—I underſtand you are a happy and flouriſhing town, and as ſoon as I come to London I will get you made a borough with repreſentatives, and then you will never be eaſy or proſperous again as long as you live."

As

As to the matter of arithmetic, I muſt own I could not have foreſeen that Meſſrs. Cocker and Wingate would ever have been regarded as proper authorities in a queſtion of civil policy.* What the *rule of three* can have to do with government, (unleſs it be the *rule of the three eſtates*) is beyond my comprehenſion. It is an excellent rule in it's way, but when applied to the more intellectual ſciences it's effects are remarkably unfortunate: In *divinity* we find it encouraging the labourer to murmur againſt his lord ‖ --- In *morals* it juſtifies the provident œconomy of Mr. Thomas Inkle,‡---and in *politics* it aims at procuring, in defiance of nature and common ſenſe, that the *many* may govern, and the *few* obey! The arithmetic of modern ſtateſmen however, like the ſpear of Achilles, can ſometimes heal the wound itſelf has inflicted. Mr. Cartwright tells us (P. 14) that "257 members are returned by ſcarcely above 6000 electors" --- then, to be ſure, we are undone --- but hold, let us look a little further --- Theſe 6000

* The judging of a poem or painting by means of a rule and compaſſes, or of elocution by means of a ſtop-watch, are well bantered by Sterne, (Triſt. Shand. Vol. III. Chap. 12.) Dr. Warton complains of the philoſophical, geometrical, and ſyſtematical ſpirit which has invaded polite literature, &c. (Warton's Eſſay on Pope, Page 209) but the intruſion of arithmetic on the province of legiſlation is ſtill more alarming, in proportion as the well-being and very exiſtence of commonwealths is of higher conſequence than the belles lettres or the arts of poliſhed life.

‖ Matt. xx.---12.

‡ Spectator No. 11. —— Citizen Act I. Sc. 2.

electors

electors are ſpread out into *one hundred and ninety-two* corporations" --- Here then we are quite right again --- and indeed the ſpreading or diffuſion of this influence is the happieſt circumſtance that could have accrued to us. We have, by this means, an efficient majority of the houſe of Commons, choſen in ſo diſperſed a manner as to be intereſted in the welfare of every part of the kingdom, and yet ſo as that they are not likely either to coaleſce into one dreadfully-formidable party, like the propoſed *fifty* for London and Middleſex, --- nor to be over-awed or reſtrained from giving a free vote, as thoſe who are elected by ſuch populous places as Yorkſhire or the Metropolis will generally be. It appears then that we have a ſenate adequate to every good purpoſe, comprehenſive of the neceſſary variety of members,* and happily more diſtinct, unconnected, and uninfluenced than could reaſonably have been expected --- *behold your* GRIEVANCES!——For my own part, I know no more of calculations than Captain Shandy, and perhaps another military gentleman, Mr. Cartwright, would have been a much better politician had he known as little; ſo that I cannot pretend to *figure away* and tell the people, as he does, (P. 57) "that they acquire a poſitive gain of 3500 *per cent*" by the above advantages --- but I think I may venture to ſay, That the conſtitution has "ſnatch'd a grace beyond the reach of art," or, that it is much better adapted to the ends in view, than the utmoſt cunning or prudence of *man's device* would ever have been likely to have

* See above page 7 in the note.

made

made it. To regulate the laws of juriſprudence by thoſe of arithmetic might be much in character for ſuch a man as Mr. Burgh, (who, I think, was the maſter of an academy) or even for Dr. Price, who, it ſeems, has a knack of *killing us all up by computation*: but for a man of family or faſhion to ſubmit to ſuch pedantry is what I ſhould not have expected. Mr. Cartwright may be very independent and uncorrupt for ought I know to the contrary, but ſo long as he embraces and defends the ſentiments in queſtion, he muſt pardon me if I acknowledge that I cannot bring myſelf to wiſh him any other *majority* than that of the Nottinghamſhire Militia.

FINIS.

BRITISH
9 JY 74
MUSEUM